

II. Inventor Search Results from Dialog

Patent Files

File 371:French Patents 1961-2002/BOPI 200209
(c) 2002 INPI. All rts. reserv.
File 344:Chinese Patents Abs Jan 1985-2006/Jan
(c) 2006 European Patent Office
File 347:JAPIO Dec 1976-2009/Mar(Updated 090708)
(c) 2009 JPO & JAPIO
File 350:Derwent WPIX 1963-2009/UD=200955
(c) 2009 Thomson Reuters
File 349:PCT FULLTEXT 1979-2009/UB=20090827|UT=20090709
(c) 2009 WIPO/Thomson
File 348:EUROPEAN PATENTS 1978-200935
(c) 2009 European Patent Office

Set	Items	Description
S1	50	AU=(SHAYA S? OR SHAYA, S? OR SHAYA (2N)(S OR STEVEN OR ST-EVE))
S2	23	AU=(MATHESON N? OR MATHESON, N? OR MATHESON (2N)(N OR NEA-L))
S3	36	AU=(SINGARAYAR J? OR SINGARAYAR, J? OR SINGARAYAR (2N)(J -OR JOHN))
S4	104	AU=(KOLLIAS N? OR KOLLIAS, N? OR KOLLIAS (2N)(N OR NIKIFOROS))
S5	263	AU=(BLOOM J? OR BLOOM, J? OR BLOOM (2N)(J OR JEFFREY OR J-EFF))
S6	1	S1 AND S2 AND S3 AND S4 AND S5
S7	451	S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5
S8	5	S7 AND IC=(G06F-017/60 OR G06F-0017/60)
S9	32	S7 AND IC=G06F
S10	5	S6 OR S8
S11	3	AU=(KILLIAS N? OR KILLIAS, N? OR KILLIAS (2N)(N OR NIKIFOROS))
S12	5	S10 OR S11

10/5/1 (Item 1 from file: 350)
DIALOG(R)File 350:Derwent WPIX
(c) 2009 Thomson Reuters. All rts. reserv.
0014233844

WPI ACC NO: 2004-419793/200439
Related WPI Acc No: 2004-419792
XRPX Acc No: N2004-333216

Personal care program provision method in retail shopping environment, involves creating personal care program comprising two elements from recommended personal care product, and recommendation for personal care activity and service

Patent Assignee: ALELES M (ALEL-I); FEY J (FEYJ-I); JOHNSON & JOHNSON
CONSUMER CO INC (JOHJ); LUEDTKE K D (LUED-I); ORLANDI M A (ORLA-I);
SHAYA S A (SHAY-I)

Inventor: ALELES M; FEY J; LUEDTKE K D; ORLANDI M A; SHAYA S A

drawings, replaced by new pages 1/12-12/12
Republication 20030814 A2 With declaration under Article 17(2)(a); without
abstract; title not checked by the International
Searching Authority.

10/5/5 (Item 1 from file: 348)
DIALOG(R)File 348:EUROPEAN PATENTS
(c) 2009 European Patent Office. All rts. reserv.
01480405

INTELLIGENT PERFORMANCE-BASED PRODUCT RECOMMENDATION SYSTEM
INTELLIGENTES PRODUKTEMPFEHLUNGSSYSTEM AUF PERFORMANCE-BASIS
SYSTEME DE RECOMMANDATION DE PRODUIT BASE SUR UNE PERFORMANCE INTELLIGENTE
PATENT ASSIGNEE:

Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., (2446375), 199 Grandview Road
, Skillman, New Jersey 08558, (US), (Applicant designated States: all)
INVENTOR:

SHAYA, Steve, 144 Portland Road, Highlands, NJ 07732, (US)
MATHESON, Neal, 170 Liberty Place, Princeton, NJ 08540, (US)
SINGARAYAR, John, Anthony, 89 Green Meadow Road, Skillman, NJ
08558, (US)
KILLIAS, Nikiforos, 406 Sunset Road, Skillman, NJ 08558, (US)
BLOOM, Jeffrey, Adam, 12 Krebs Road, Plainsboro, NJ 08536,
(US)

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE:

Mercer, Christopher Paul (46611), Carpmiels & Ransford 43, Bloomsbury
Square, London WC1A 2RA, (GB)

PATENT (CC, No, Kind, Date): EP 1346299 A1 030924 (Basic)
WO 2002033628 020425

APPLICATION (CC, No, Date): EP 2001987928 011017; WO 2001US32294 011017
PRIORITY (CC, No, Date): US 241405 P 001018

DESIGNATED STATES: AT; BE; CH; CY; DE; DK; ES; FI; FR; GB; GR; IE; IT; LI;
LU; MC; NL; PT; SE; TR

EXTENDED DESIGNATED STATES: AL; LT; LV; MK; RO; SI

INTERNATIONAL PATENT CLASS (V7): G06F-017/60

NOTE: No A-document published by EPO

LEGAL STATUS (Type, Pub Date, Kind, Text):

Application: 021030 A2 International application. (Art. 158(1))

Application: 021030 A2 International application entering European
phase

Application: 030924 A1 Published application with search report

Examination: 030924 A1 Date of request for examination: 20030515

Change: 080423 A1 Title of invention (German) changed: 20080423

Change: 080423 A1 Title of invention (English) changed: 20080423

Change: 080423 A1 Title of invention (French) changed: 20080423

LANGUAGE (Publication,Procedural,Application): English; English; English

NPL Files

File 583:Gale Group Globalbase(TM) 1986-2002/Dec 13
(c) 2002 Gale/Cengage

File 474:New York Times Abs 1969-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 The New York Times

File 475:Wall Street Journal Abs 1973-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 The New York Times

File 35:Dissertation Abs Online 1861-2009/Jul
 (c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning
 File 65:Inside Conferences 1993-2009/Aug 28
 (c) 2009 BLDSC all rts. reserv.
 File 99:Wilson Appl. Sci & Tech Abs 1983-2009/Aug
 (c) 2009 The HW Wilson Co.
 File 256:TecTrends 1982-2009/Aug W5
 (c) 2009 Info.Sources Inc. All rights res.
 File 2:INSPEC 1898-2009/Aug W4
 (c) 2009 The IET
 File 141:Readers Guide 1983-2009/Aug
 (c) 2009 The HW Wilson Co
 File 144:Pascal 1973-2009/Aug W5
 (c) 2009 INIST/CNRS
 File 610:Business Wire 1999-2009/Sep 01
 (c) 2009 Business Wire.
 File 613:PR Newswire 1999-2009/Aug 31
 (c) 2009 PR Newswire Association Inc
 File 634:San Jose Mercury Jun 1985-2009/Aug 29
 (c) 2009 San Jose Mercury News
 File 810:Business Wire 1986-1999/Feb 28
 (c) 1999 Business Wire
 File 813:PR Newswire 1987-1999/Apr 30
 (c) 1999 PR Newswire Association Inc
 File 20:Dialog Global Reporter 1997-2009/Aug 31
 (c) 2009 Dialog
 File 15:ABI/Inform(R) 1971-2009/Aug 31
 (c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning
 File 624:McGraw-Hill Publications 1985-2009/Sep 01
 (c) 2009 McGraw-Hill Co. Inc
 File 9:Business & Industry(R) Jul/1994-2009/Aug 31
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
 File 16:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1990-2009/Aug 07
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
 File 148:Gale Group Trade & Industry DB 1976-2009/Aug 13
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
 File 160:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1972-1989
 (c) 1999 The Gale Group
 File 275:Gale Group Computer DB(TM) 1983-2009/Aug 03
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
 File 621:Gale Group New Prod.Annou.(R) 1985-2009/Jul 24
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
 File 636:Gale Group Newsletter DB(TM) 1987-2009/Aug 07
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
 File 262:CBCA Fulltext 1982-2009/Aug W4
 (c) 2009 ProQuest.
 File 484:Periodical Abs Plustext 1986-2009/Aug W4
 (c) 2009 ProQuest
 File 477:Irish Times 1999-2009/Sep 01
 (c) 2009 Irish Times
 File 710:Times/Sun.Times(London) Jun 1988-2009/Aug 31
 (c) 2009 Times Newspapers
 File 711:Independent(London) Sep 1988-2006/Dec 12
 (c) 2006 Newspaper Publ. PLC
 File 756:Daily/Sunday Telegraph 2000-2009/Sep 01
 (c) 2009 Telegraph Group
 File 757:Mirror Publications/Independent Newspapers 2000-2009/Sep 01(c) 2009

File 387:The Denver Post 1994-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 Denver Post
File 471:New York Times Fulltext 1980-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 The New York Times
File 492:Arizona Repub/Phoenix Gaz 19862002/Jan 06
(c) 2002 Phoenix Newspapers
File 494:St LouisPost-Dispatch 1988-2009/Jun 19
(c) 2009 St Louis Post-Dispatch
File 631:Boston Globe 1980-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Boston Globe
File 633:Phil.Inquirer 1983-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Philadelphia Newspapers Inc
File 638:Newsday/New York Newsday 1987-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Newsday Inc.
File 640:San Francisco Chronicle 1988-2009/Aug 30
(c) 2009 Chronicle Publ. Co.
File 641:Rocky Mountain News Jun 1989-2009/Jan 16
(c) 2009 Scripps Howard News
File 702:Miami Herald 1983-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 The Miami Herald Publishing Co.
File 703:USA Today 1989-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 USA Today
File 704:(Portland)The Oregonian 1989-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 The Oregonian
File 713:Atlanta J/Const. 1989-2009/Mar 08
(c) 2009 Atlanta Newspapers
File 714:(Baltimore) The Sun 1990-2009/Aug 30
(c) 2009 Baltimore Sun
File 715:Christian Sci.Mon. 1989-2009/Jul 20
(c) 2009 Christian Science Monitor
File 725:(Cleveland)Plain Dealer Aug 1991-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 The Plain Dealer
File 735:St. Petersburg Times 1989- 2009/Aug 28
(c) 2009 St. Petersburg Times
File 635:Business Dateline(R) 1985-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning
File 47:Gale Group Magazine DB(TM) 1959-2009/Aug 19
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
File 570:Gale Group MARS(R) 1984-2009/Aug 07
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage

Set	Items	Description
S1	17	AU=(SHAYA S? OR SHAYA, S? OR SHAYA (2N)(S OR STEVEN OR STEVE)) OR BY= SHAYA (2N)(S OR STEVEN OR STEVE)
S2	137	AU=(MATHESON N? OR MATHESON, N? OR MATHESON (2N)(N OR NEA-L)) OR BY= MATHESON (2N)(N OR NEAL)
S3	3	AU=(SINGARAYAR J? OR SINGARAYAR, J? OR SINGARAYAR (2N)(J - OR JOHN)) OR BY= SINGARAYAR (2N)(J OR JOHN)
S4	677	AU=(KOLLIAS N? OR KOLLIAS, N? OR KOLLIAS (2N)(N OR NIKIFOROS)) OR BY= KOLLIAS (2N)(N OR NIKIFOROS)
S5	2556	AU=(BLOOM J? OR BLOOM, J? OR BLOOM (2N)(J OR JEFFREY OR J-EFF)) OR BY= BLOOM(2N)(J OR JEFFREY OR JEFF)
S6	0	AU=(KILLIAS N? OR KILLIAS, N? OR KILLIAS (2N)(N OR NIKIFOROS)) OR BY= KILLIAS (2N)(N OR NIKIFOROS)
S7	0	S1 AND S2 AND S3 AND S4 AND S5
S8	3390	S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5
S9	0	LIMITALL IS ON FOR S8

S10 39 (PRODUCT?? OR ITEM?? OR ARTICLE?? OR THING?? OR MERCHANDISE
 OR SOLUTION?? OR GOODS OR MAKEUP OR COSMETIC? OR LOTION?? OR
 CREAM?? OR SHAMPOO??)(10N)(RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? -
 OR ENDORS?)

S11 1119 CONSUMER?? OR CUSTOMER?? OR SHOPPER?? OR BUYER?? OR PURCHA-
 S? OR INDIVIDUAL?? OR PERSON?? OR CLIENT? OR USER??

S12 33 S10 AND S11

12/5/1 (Item 1 from file: 99)
 DIALOG(R)File 99:Wilson Appl. Sci & Tech Abs
 (c) 2009 The HW Wilson Co. All rts. reserv.
 1896079 H.W. WILSON RECORD NUMBER: BAST99042052
 Copy protection for DVD video
 Bloom, Jeffrey A; Cox, Ingemar J; Kalker, Ton
 Proceedings of the IEEE v. 87 no7 (July 1999) p. 1267-76
 DOCUMENT TYPE: Feature Article ISSN: 0018-9219 LANGUAGE: English
 RECORD STATUS: Corrected or revised record

ABSTRACT: The prospect of consumer digital versatile disk (DVD) recorders highlights the challenge of protecting copyrighted video content from piracy. We describe the copy-protection system currently under consideration for DVD. The copy-protection system broadly tries to prevent illicit copies from being made from either the analog or digital I/O channels of DVD recorders. An analog copy-protection system is utilized to protect the NTSC/PAL output channel by preventing copies to VHS. The digital transmission of content is protected by a robust encryption protocol between two communicating devices. Watermarking is used to encode copy-control information retrievable from both digital and analog signals. Hence, such embedded signals avoid the need for metadata to be carried in either the digital or analog domains. Finally, the copy-protection system provides the capability for one-generation copying. We discuss some proposed solutions and some of the implementation issues that are being addressed. Copyright 1999, IEEE.

DESCRIPTORS: DVD technology; Digital watermarks; Intellectual property--Protection;

III. Text Search Results from Dialog

A. Patent Files, Abstract

File 371:French Patents 1961-2002/BOPI 200209

(c) 2002 INPI. All rts. reserv.

File 344:Chinese Patents Abs Jan 1985-2006/Jan

(c) 2006 European Patent Office

File 347:JAPIO Dec 1976-2009/Mar(Updated 090708)

(c) 2009 JPO & JAPIO

File 350:Derwent WPIX 1963-2009/UD=200955

(c) 2009 Thomson Reuters

Set	Items	Description
S1	6966213	PRODUCT?? OR ITEM?? OR ARTICLE?? OR THING?? OR MERCHANDISE OR SOLUTION?? OR GOODS OR MAKEUP OR COSMETIC? OR LOTION?? OR - CREAM?? OR SHAMPOO??
S2	37551	S1(S) (RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)
S3	2341213	CONSUMER?? OR CUSTOMER?? OR SHOPPER?? OR BUYER?? OR PURCHA- S? OR INDIVIDUAL?? OR PERSON?? OR CLIENT? OR USER??
S4	7693857	NEED?? OR REQUIREMENT? OR REQUEST? OR DEMAND? OR PROBLEM? - OR ISSUE? OR PREFERENCE?? OR DESIRE?? OR CONCERN?? OR INTERES- T?? OR GOAL??
S5	303614	(DETERMIN? OR FIGUR? OR CALCULAT? OR COMPUT? OR ASCERTAIN? OR ASSESS?) (S) (LIKELIHOOD? OR PROBAB? OR POSSIB? OR ODDS OR P- OTENTIAL?)
S6	4468489	S1(S) (PERFORM? OR SUCCEED? OR SUCCESS? OR ACHIEV? OR ACCOM- PLISH? OR USEFUL? OR RESPONSIVE? OR RESPOND? OR SOLV? OR FIX?- ?? OR MEET?)
S7	689823	S3(S) (CLASSIF? OR CATEGORI? OR GROUP? OR SORT? OR MATCH? OR LINK? OR CONNECT? OR POOL???)
S8	37545	S7(S) (SIMILAR? OR ALIKE OR COMMON OR RESEMBL?)
S9	467	S2 AND S3 AND S5 AND S7
S10	289	S9 AND S4 AND S6
S11	92	S10 AND IC=(G06F-017/60 OR G06F-0017/60 OR G06Q-010/00 OR G06Q-0010/00 OR G06Q-030/00 OR G06Q-0030/00)
S12	32	S10 AND EC=G06Q-030/00A
S13	24	S10 AND MC=(T01-J16C1 OR T01-N01A2 OR T01-N01D OR T01-N02A- 2)
S14	10	S11 AND S13
S15	40	S12 OR S14
S16	95	S2 AND S3 AND S5 AND S8
S17	90	S16 AND (S4 OR S6)
S18	18	S17 AND IC=(G06F-017/60 OR G06F-0017/60 OR G06Q-010/00 OR G06Q-0010/00 OR G06Q-030/00 OR G06Q-0030/00)
S19	7	S17 AND EC=G06Q-030/00A
S20	8	S17 AND MC=(T01-J16C1 OR T01-N01A2 OR T01-N01D OR T01-N02A- 2)
S21	23	S18:S20
S22	57	S15 OR S21
S23	20	S22 AND AY=1950:2001
S24	298219	S1(15N) (SUBSTRATE OR SKIN OR HAIR)
S25	831	S24(S) (RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)
S26	13	S25 AND S5 AND S7
S27	1	S26 AND IC=(G06F OR G06Q)

Title Terms/Index Terms/Additional Words: CONSUME; BUY; GROUP;
MANAGEMENT; ELECTRONIC; NETWORK; NOTIFICATION; AGENT; ENTITY; QUOTATION;
PRICE; RECEIVE; PURCHASE; PRODUCT; SPECIFIC

Class Codes

International Classification (+ Attributes)

IPC + Level Value Position Status Version

G06Q-0030/00 A I F B 20060101

G06Q-0030/00 A I R 20060101

G06Q-0030/00 C I F B 20060101

G06Q-0030/00 C I R 20060101

ECLA: G06Q-030/00C

US Classification, Current Main: 705-026000

US Classification, Issued: 70526

File Segment: EPI;

DWPI Class: T01

Manual Codes (EPI/S-X): T01-H07C5A; T01-H07C5E; T01-J05A1; T01-S03

B. Patent Files, Full-Text

File 349:PCT FULLTEXT 1979-2009/UB=20090827|UT=20090709

(c) 2009 WIPO/Thomson

File 348:EUROPEAN PATENTS 1978-200935

(c) 2009 European Patent Office

Set	Items	Description
S1	1669188	PRODUCT?? OR ITEM?? OR ARTICLE?? OR THING?? OR MERCHANDISE OR SOLUTION?? OR GOODS OR MAKEUP OR COSMETIC? OR LOTION?? OR - CREAM?? OR SHAMPOO??
S2	88252	S1(10N)(RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)
S3	1444027	CONSUMER?? OR CUSTOMER?? OR SHOPPER?? OR BUYER?? OR PURCHA- S? OR INDIVIDUAL?? OR PERSON?? OR CLIENT? OR USER??
S4	3496587	NEED?? OR REQUIREMENT? OR REQUEST? OR DEMAND? OR PROBLEM? - OR ISSUE? OR PREFERENCE?? OR DESIRE?? OR CONCERN?? OR INTERES- T?? OR GOAL??
S5	335871	(DETERMIN? OR FIGUR? OR CALCULAT? OR COMPUT? OR ASCERTAIN? OR ASSESS?) (10N)(LIKELIHOOD? OR PROBAB? OR POSSIB? OR ODDS OR POTENTIAL?)
S6	704007	S1(20N)(PERFORM? OR SUCCEED? OR SUCCESS? OR ACHIEV? OR ACC- OMPLISH? OR USEFUL? OR RESPONSIVE? OR RESPOND? OR SOLV? OR FI- X??? OR MEET?)
S7	399050	S3(15N)(CLASSIF? OR CATEGORI? OR GROUP? OR SORT? OR MATCH? OR LINK? OR CONNECT? OR POOL???)
S8	36694	S7(15N)(SIMILAR? OR ALIKE OR COMMON OR RESEMBL?)
S9	250	S2(S)S5(S)S7
S10	217	S9(S)(S4 OR S6)
S11	137	S9(S)S4(S)S6
S12	30	S11 AND IC=(G06F-017/60 OR G06F-0017/60 OR G06Q-010/00 OR G06Q-0010/00 OR G06Q-030/00 OR G06Q-0030/00)
S13	48	S10 AND IC=(G06F-017/60 OR G06F-0017/60 OR G06Q-010/00 OR G06Q-0010/00 OR G06Q-030/00 OR G06Q-0030/00)
S14	69	S2(S)S5(S)S8
S15	17	S14 AND IC=(G06F-017/60 OR G06F-0017/60 OR G06Q-010/00 OR

G06Q-0010/00 OR G06Q-030/00 OR G06Q-0030/00)

S16 208 S9(S)S4

S17 48 S16 AND IC=(G06F-017/60 OR G06F-0017/60 OR G06Q-010/00 OR
G06Q-0010/00 OR G06Q-030/00 OR G06Q-0030/00)

S18 49 S13 OR S17

S19 34 S18 AND AY=1950:2001

19/3,K/1 (Item 1 from file: 349)

DIALOG(R)File 349:PCT FULLTEXT

(c) 2009 WIPO/Thomson. All rts. reserv.

01008577 **Image available**

SERVICES FOR GENERATION OF ELECTRONIC MARKETPLACE LISTINGS USING PERSONAL
PURCHASE HISTORIES OR OTHER INDICIA OF PRODUCT OWNERSHIP
SERVICES DE GENERATION DE LISTES DE MARCHES ELECTRIQUES A L'AIDE
D'HISTORIQUES D'ACHATS PERSONNELS OU D'AUTRES INDICES DE LA PROPRIETE
DE PRODUITS

Patent Applicant/Assignee:

AMAZON COM INC, 1200 12th Avenue South, Suite 1200, Seattle, WA 98144, US
, US (Residence), US (Nationality)

Inventor(s):

KOTAS Paul, 119 Aloha Street, Seattle, WA 98109, US,
ROSEMAN Neil C, 337 25th Avenue East, Seattle, WA 98112, US,
BEZOS Jeffrey P, P.O. Box 81226, Seattle, WA 98108, US,
MOORE Bruce C, 2929 First Avenue #1022, Seattle, WA 98121, US,
DALZELL Richard L, P.O. Box 81226, Seattle, WA 98108, US,
BLACKBURN Jeffrey M, 3810 E. McGivra Street, Seattle, WA 98144, US,

Legal Representative:

ALTMAN Daniel E (agent), Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP, 2040 Main
Street, Fourteenth Floor, Irvine, CA 92614, US,

Patent and Priority Information (Country, Number, Date):

Patent: WO 200338560 A2-A3 20030508 (WO 0338560)

Application: WO 2002US34853 20021030 (PCT/WO US2002034853)

Priority Application: US 2001336409 20011031; US 2002351207 20020122; US
2002142655 20020509

Designated States:

(Protection type is "patent" unless otherwise stated - for applications
prior to 2004)

AE AG AL AM AT AU AZ BA BB BG BR BY BZ CA CH CN CO CR CU CZ (utility
model) CZ DE (utility model) DE DK (utility model) DK DM DZ EC EE
(utility model) EE ES FI (utility model) FI GB GD GE GH GM HR HU ID IL IN
IS JP KE KG KP KR KZ LC LK LR LS LT LU LV MA MD MG MK MN MW MX MZ NO NZ
OM PH PL PT RO RU SD SE SG SI SK (utility model) SK SL TJ TM TN TR TT TZ
UA UG UZ VC VN YU ZA ZM ZW
(EP) AT BE BG CH CY CZ DE DK EE ES FI FR GB GR IE IT LU MC NL PT SE SK TR
(OA) BF BJ CF CG CI CM GA GN GQ GW ML MR NE SN TD TG
(AP) GH GM KE LS MW MZ SD SL SZ TZ UG ZM ZW
(EA) AM AZ BY KG KZ MD RU TJ TM

Publication Language: English

Filing Language: English

Fulltext Word Count: 17150

Main International Patent Class (v7): G06F-017/60

Fulltext Availability:

Detailed Description

IV. Text Search Results from Dialog

A. NPL Files, Abstract

File 583:Gale Group Globalbase(TM) 1986-2002/Dec 13
 (c) 2002 Gale/Cengage
 File 474:New York Times Abs 1969-2009/Sep 01
 (c) 2009 The New York Times
 File 475:Wall Street Journal Abs 1973-2009/Sep 01
 (c) 2009 The New York Times
 File 35:Dissertation Abs Online 1861-2009/Jul
 (c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning
 File 65:Inside Conferences 1993-2009/Aug 28
 (c) 2009 BLDSC all rts. reserv.
 File 99:Wilson Appl. Sci & Tech Abs 1983-2009/Aug
 (c) 2009 The HW Wilson Co.
 File 256:TecTrends 1982-2009/Aug W5
 (c) 2009 Info.Sources Inc. All rights res.
 File 2:INSPEC 1898-2009/Aug W4
 (c) 2009 The IET
 File 141:Readers Guide 1983-2009/Aug
 (c) 2009 The HW Wilson Co
 File 144:Pascal 1973-2009/Aug W5
 (c) 2009 INIST/CNRS

Set	Items	Description
S1	5902383	PRODUCT?? OR ITEM?? OR ARTICLE?? OR THING?? OR MERCHANDISE OR SOLUTION?? OR GOODS OR MAKEUP OR COSMETIC? OR LOTION?? OR - CREAM?? OR SHAMPOO??
S2	650278	S1(S) (RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)
S3	3036801	CONSUMER?? OR CUSTOMER?? OR SHOPPER?? OR BUYER?? OR PURCHA- S? OR INDIVIDUAL?? OR PERSON?? OR CLIENT? OR USER??
S4	7243641	NEED?? OR REQUIREMENT? OR REQUEST? OR DEMAND? OR PROBLEM? - OR ISSUE? OR PREFERENCE?? OR DESIRE?? OR CONCERN?? OR INTERES- T?? OR GOAL??
S5	1420070	{DETERMIN? OR FIGUR? OR CALCULAT? OR COMPUT? OR ASCERTAIN? OR ASSESS?}(S) (LIKELIHOOD? OR PROBAB? OR POSSIB? OR ODDS OR P- OTENTIAL?)
S6	1128837	S1(S) (PERFORM? OR SUCCEED? OR SUCCESS? OR ACHIEV? OR ACCOM- PLISH? OR USEFUL? OR RESPONSIVE? OR RESPOND? OR SOLV? OR FIX?- ?? OR MEET?)
S7	580508	S3(S) (CLASSIF? OR CATEGORY? OR GROUP? OR SORT? OR MATCH? OR LINK? OR CONNECT? OR POOL???)
S8	69639	S7(S) (SIMILAR? OR ALIKE OR COMMON OR RESEMBL?)
S9	2215	S2 AND S5 AND S7
S10	833	S9 AND S4 AND S6
S11	381	S2 AND S5 AND S8
S12	136	S11 AND S4 AND S6
S13	44	S12 NOT S12/2001:2009
S14	41	RD (unique items)
S15	60943	S1(15N) (SUBSTRATE OR SKIN OR HAIR)
S16	5055	S15(S) (RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)
S17	8	S16 AND S4 AND S5 AND S7

S18 16 S16 AND S5 AND S7
 S19 121 S16 AND S3 AND S4
 S20 63 S19 AND (S5 OR S6)
 S21 71 S17 OR S18 OR S20
 S22 29 S21 NOT S21/2001:2009
 S23 28 RD (unique items)

14/5/1 (Item 1 from file: 35)
 DIALOG(R)File 35:Dissertation Abs Online
 (c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning. All rts. reserv.
 01809061 ORDER NO: AADAA-I9936993
 Probabilistic preference modeling
 Author: Chien, Yung-Hsin
 Degree: Ph.D.
 Year: 1998
 Corporate Source/Institution: The University of Texas at Austin (0227)
 Supervisor: Edward I. George
 Source: VOLUME 60/07-B OF DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS INTERNATIONAL.
 PAGE 3356. 111 PAGES
 Descriptors: STATISTICS ; BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, MARKETING
 Descriptor Codes: 0463; 0338
 ISBN: 0-599-38307-0

The first part of this dissertation addresses the general setup where a set of ~~items~~ is partially evaluated by a set of judges, in the sense that not every ~~item~~ is evaluated by every judge. For this setup, the collaborative filtering ~~problem~~ is to predict the missing evaluations from the observed evaluations. As opposed to current collaborative filtering ~~solutions~~ based on classical statistical methods such as linear correlation, a Bayesian ~~solution~~ is ~~proposed~~. The main idea is to model subjects' ratings as realizations of a probability distribution which captures similarity across ~~items~~ and individuals. Data is then used to obtain posterior distributions which can be explored using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods such as the Gibbs sampler and the reversible jump Metropolis-Hastings algorithms. One important advantage of the Bayesian approach is the robustness to different patterns of missingness in the ~~item~~-judge evaluations.

The second part of this dissertation addresses ~~consumers'~~ shopping ~~preferences~~ in retail stores. Manufacturers and retailers ~~alike~~ are interested in the link between the selection of a particular brand by a ~~shopper~~ and any resulting impact on store ~~performance~~. Unfortunately, the best developed tools for analyzing retail sales data focus on the relationship between a brand's marketing activity and the sales of that brand itself, or, ~~possibly~~, other brands in the category. We ~~propose~~ to establish a link between the selection of a particular brand and the size and value of the marketbasket containing that brand, statistics more closely related to store ~~performance~~. In addition we offer an alternative to the model of random inclusion of ~~items~~ in marketbaskets implicitly used by industry today. The alternative model of random inclusion is used as a benchmark against which to compare the observed average value of marketbaskets containing a particular brand. To ~~assess~~ the contrasts between the brand choices and random choices in terms of basket values, we decompose the gap between observed marketbasket value and model-defined expected marketbasket value into quantity synergy (the dollar value of the

in the method.

The major results of the study reveal that there are significant differences among the methods studied, but little interaction between experience and preferred method or between model complexity and preferred method. Specifically, an elicitation technique which requires explicit numerical estimates of **preferences** (the naive search) requires more time and is less understood than one which requires only qualitative **preference** information (Dyer's algorithm and conjoint measurement). Alternatively, comparing the methods in terms of subject-machine interaction reveals that the interactive techniques produced solutions closer to the ideal solution (using the infinity metric) and subjects placed more confidence in them than the non-interactive conjoint measurement. In addition, the interactive techniques were perceived to have more structure than the non-interactive. These results held regardless of prior experience of subject.

The only dependent variable in the study to reveal an interaction effect between experience and preferred method was ease of use, with conjoint measurement preferred by inexperienced subjects. In addition, an interaction was found between departmental model and method, measured on the dependent variable distance to the ideal solution, with conjoint measurement performing best with less complex models. Therefore, the major conclusion drawn from the statistical results is that conjoint measurement estimation with linear weights produces solutions closer to the ideal than interactive techniques, given a relatively simple problem. With a more complex model, the interactive elicitation techniques outperformed conjoint measurement on a variety of objective and subjective measures.

B. NPL Files, Full-text

File 610:Business Wire 1999-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Business Wire.
File 613:PR Newswire 1999-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 PR Newswire Association Inc
File 634:San Jose Mercury Jun 1985-2009/Aug 29
(c) 2009 San Jose Mercury News
File 810:Business Wire 1986-1999/Feb 28
(c) 1999 Business Wire
File 813:PR Newswire 1987-1999/Apr 30
(c) 1999 PR Newswire Association Inc
File 20:Dialog Global Reporter 1997-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Dialog
File 15:ABI/Inform(R) 1971-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning
File 624:McGraw-Hill Publications 1985-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 McGraw-Hill Co. Inc
File 262:CBCA Fulltext 1982-2009/Aug W4
(c) 2009 ProQuest.

Set	Items	Description
S1	27038478	PRODUCT?? OR ITEM?? OR ARTICLE?? OR THING?? OR MERCHANDISE OR SOLUTION?? OR GOODS OR MAKEUP OR COSMETIC? OR LOTION?? OR - CREAM?? OR SHAMPOO??
S2	663299	S1(10N) (RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)

S3 26124314 CONSUMER?? OR CUSTOMER?? OR SHOPPER?? OR BUYER?? OR PURCHA-
S? OR INDIVIDUAL?? OR PERSON?? OR CLIENT? OR USER??
S4 503447 (DETERMIN? OR FIGUR? OR CALCULAT? OR COMPUT? OR ASCERTAIN?
OR ASSESS?) (10N) (LIKELIHOOD? OR PROBAB? OR POSSIB? OR ODDS OR
POTENTIAL?)
S5 4925231 S1(20N)(PERFORM? OR SUCCEED? OR SUCCESS? OR ACHIEV? OR ACC-
OMPLISH? OR USEFUL? OR RESPONSIVE? OR RESPOND? OR SOLV? OR FI-
X??? OR MEET?)
S6 456 S2(S)S3(S)S4(S)S5
S7 0 LIMITALL IS ON FOR S6
S8 171 S3(15N)(CLASSIF? OR CATEGORI? OR GROUP? OR SORT? OR MATCH?
OR POOL???)
S9 284 SIMILAR? OR ALIKE OR COMMON OR RESEMBL?
S10 28 SUBSTRATE OR SKIN OR HAIR
S11 129 S8 AND S9
S12 26 S11 NOT S11/2001:2009
S13 5 S10 NOT S10/2001:2009
S14 27 S12 OR S13

14/3,K/4 (Item 4 from file: 15)
DIALOG(R)File 15:ABI/Inform(R)
(c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning. All rts. reserv.
02022506 53818583
Establishing a foundation for collaborative scenario elicitation
Hickey, Ann M; Dean, Douglas L; Nunamaker, Jay F Jr
Database for Advances in Information Systems v30n3/4 PP: 92-110 Summer
1999
JRNL CODE: DFA
WORD COUNT: 8845

ABSTRACT: How increasing the structure of scenario definitions affects scenario quality and the efficiency of scenario definition by individual users. During a laboratory experiment, subjects defined scenarios using a general-purpose GSS, Group Systems Group Outliner, with one of three textual scenario formats that ranged from unstructured to very structured. Scenario quality and the efficiency of scenario definition by users...
TEXT: Abstract

Eliciting and integrating requirements from large groups of diverse users remains a major challenge for the software engineering community. Scenarios are becoming recognized as valuable means of identifying actions taken by users when executing a...

...literature indicates that, although there is widespread agreement on the usefulness of scenarios, there are many unanswered questions about how to elicit scenario definitions from individual users and user groups efficiently.

This research examines how increasing the structure of scenario definitions affects scenario quality and the efficiency of scenario definition by individual users. During a laboratory experiment, subjects defined scenarios using a general-purpose GSS, Group Systems Group Outliner, with one of three textual scenario formats that ranged from unstructured to very structured. Scenario quality and the

chances of success in a foreign market. For instance, Canada and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) have somewhat similar per capita GNP figures. From a standpoint of similarity in national characters alone, one could postulate that a firm from the United States will find it easier to deal with buyers from Canada than...

...in a variety of international business issues such as market segmentation, product planning, international promotion, and comparative studies on management and organizational behavior.

In a similar vein, the five dimensions of organizational culture we propose also need to be empirically investigated and compared to other frameworks depicting organizational culture. The marketing...typically operate below the level of conscious awareness, they operate on an individual at several levels, and are therefore difficult to comprehend. Scholars and practitioners alike have come to the realization that it is culture that largely determines the way in which various phenomena are perceived, what one talks about, how...Kenneth Roering, editors. Review of Marketing. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.

Churchill, Gilbert A., Robert H. Collins & William A. Strang. 1975. Should retail salespersons be similar to their customers? Journal of Retailing, 51(3): 29-42.

--, Neil M. Ford & Orville C. Walker. 1979. Personal characteristics of salespeople and the attractiveness of...between marketing effectiveness, corporate culture, and market orientation. Journal of International Business Studies, 21(3): 451-68.

Padgett, Valerie R. & Robert J. Wolosin. 1980. Cognitive similarity in dyadic communication. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 39(4): 654-9.

Parsons, Talcott & Edward A. Shils, editors. 1951. Toward a general theory of...

File 9:Business & Industry(R) Jul/1994-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
File 16:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1990-2009/Aug 07
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
File 148:Gale Group Trade & Industry DB 1976-2009/Aug 13
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
File 160:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1972-1989
(c) 1999 The Gale Group
File 275:Gale Group Computer DB(TM) 1983-2009/Aug 03
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
File 621:Gale Group New Prod.Annou.(R) 1985-2009/Jul 24
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
File 636:Gale Group Newsletter DB(TM) 1987-2009/Aug 07
(c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
File 484:Periodical Abs Plustext 1986-2009/Aug W4
(c) 2009 ProQuest

Set	Items	Description
S1	29464008	PRODUCT?? OR ITEM?? OR ARTICLE?? OR THING?? OR MERCHANDISE OR SOLUTION?? OR GOODS OR MAKEUP OR COSMETIC? OR LOTION?? OR -

CREAM?? OR SHAMPOO??

S2	630328	S1(10N)(RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)
S3	24641261	CONSUMER?? OR CUSTOMER?? OR SHOPPER?? OR BUYER?? OR PURCHA- S? OR INDIVIDUAL?? OR PERSON?? OR CLIENT? OR USER??
S4	478923	(DETERMIN? OR FIGUR? OR CALCULAT? OR COMPUT? OR ASCERTAIN? OR ASSESS?)(10N)(LIKELIHOOD? OR PROBAB? OR POSSIB? OR ODDS OR POTENTIAL?)
S5	2107870	S3(10N)(CLASSIF? OR CATEGORI? OR GROUP? OR SORT? OR MATCH? OR POOL???)
S6	85	S2(S)S3(S)S4(S)S5
S7	40	S6 NOT S6/2001:2009
S8	36	RD (unique items)

8/3,K/1 (Item 1 from file: 9)
 DIALOG(R)File 9:Business & Industry(R)
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage. All rts. reserv.
 02091460 Supplier Number: 25608865
 CustomerCast Offers Loyalty Measurement Service
 (CustomerCast introduced loyalty measurement system for Internet-based
 businesses; system measures likelihood of customers to recommend or
 repeatedly use company's products and services)
 iMarketing News, v 2, n 8, p 44
 February 28, 2000
 DOCUMENT TYPE: Journal; News Brief (United States)
 LANGUAGE: English RECORD TYPE: Fulltext
 WORD COUNT: 75

TEXT:

CustomerCast Inc., Mountain View, CA, last week announced a loyalty measurement system for Internet-based businesses that want a single metric combined from several customer satisfaction tests to calculate the effectiveness of their customer relationships.

The system measures the likelihood of customers to recommend or repeatedly use a company's products and services. It categorizes each customer as loyal, favorable, vulnerable or lost by performing various research steps. CustomerCast did not have pricing available as of press time.

8/3,K/4 (Item 2 from file: 16)
 DIALOG(R)File 16:Gale Group PROMT(R)
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage. All rts. reserv.
 05485933 Supplier Number: 48312014 (USE FORMAT 7 FOR FULLTEXT)
 Manhattan Associates Acquires Performance Analysis Corporation
 PR Newswire, p0223ATM020
 Feb 23, 1998
 Language: English Record Type: Fulltext
 Document Type: Newswire; Trade
 Word Count: 463

... SLOT-IT(TM), the pickline optimization and maintenance system, calculates the best possible location in the pickline for every item in the warehouse based on user selectable rules such as product grouping, "golden zone" slotting, and ergonomic factors. SLOT-IT(TM)

nutrition attitude and purchase likelihood. However, the interaction between nutrition level and age also was significant ($p < .05$) for both nutrition attitude and purchase likelihood. Plots of these interactions are shown in Figure 1. Across age, both purchase likelihood and nutrition attitude means decrease (slightly) for the product with higher nutrition level and increase for the product with lower nutrition level. As Figure 1 suggests, this leads to smaller differences in purchase likelihood and nutrition attitude across nutrition value levels for the older group of consumers. For younger consumers, differences in nutrition attitude and purchase likelihood between nutrition levels are highly significant ($t = 5.3$ and 5.4 , respectively, $p < .001$). For older consumers, the difference was significant for nutrition attitude ($t = 2.2$, $p < .05$) and marginally significant for purchase likelihood ($t = 1.7$, $p < .10$). Findings pertaining to the dependent measure of label understandability show a main effect of age ($F = 6.4$, $p < .02$), and means in Table 1 indicate that older consumers perceived the labels as less understandable than younger consumers. However, these results should be interpreted with caution given the three-way interaction among format, age, and nutrition level ($F = 3.5$, $p < .05$). For...

File 477:Irish Times 1999-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Irish Times
File 710:Times/Sun.Times(London) Jun 1988-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Times Newspapers
File 711:Independent(London) Sep 1988-2006/Dec 12
(c) 2006 Newspaper Publ. PLC
File 756:Daily/Sunday Telegraph 2000-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Telegraph Group
File 757:Mirror Publications/Independent Newspapers 2000-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009
File 387:The Denver Post 1994-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 Denver Post
File 471:New York Times Fulltext 1980-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 The New York Times
File 492:Arizona Repub/Phoenix Gaz 19862002/Jan 06
(c) 2002 Phoenix Newspapers
File 494:St LouisPost-Dispatch 1988-2009/Jun 19
(c) 2009 St Louis Post-Dispatch
File 631:Boston Globe 1980-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Boston Globe
File 633:Phil.Inquirer 1983-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Philadelphia Newspapers Inc
File 638:Newsday/New York Newsday 1987-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 Newsday Inc.
File 640:San Francisco Chronicle 1988-2009/Aug 30
(c) 2009 Chronicle Publ. Co.
File 641:Rocky Mountain News Jun 1989-2009/Jan 16
(c) 2009 Scripps Howard News
File 702:Miami Herald 1983-2009/Sep 01
(c) 2009 The Miami Herald Publishing Co.
File 703:USA Today 1989-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 USA Today
File 704:(Portland)The Oregonian 1989-2009/Aug 31
(c) 2009 The Oregonian

File 713:Atlanta J/Const. 1989-2009/Mar 08
 (c) 2009 Atlanta Newspapers
 File 714:(Baltimore) The Sun 1990-2009/Aug 30
 (c) 2009 Baltimore Sun
 File 715:Christian Sci.Mon. 1989-2009/Jul 20
 (c) 2009 Christian Science Monitor
 File 725:(Cleveland)Plain Dealer Aug 1991-2009/Aug 31
 (c) 2009 The Plain Dealer
 File 735:St. Petersburg Times 1989- 2009/Aug 28
 (c) 2009 St. Petersburg Times
 File 635:Business Dateline(R) 1985-2009/Sep 01
 (c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning
 File 47:Gale Group Magazine DB(TM) 1959-2009/Aug 19
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage
 File 570:Gale Group MARS(R) 1984-2009/Aug 07
 (c) 2009 Gale/Cengage

Set	Items	Description
S1	12848054	PRODUCT?? OR ITEM?? OR ARTICLE?? OR THING?? OR MERCHANDISE OR SOLUTION?? OR GOODS OR MAKEUP OR COSMETIC? OR LOTION?? OR - CREAM?? OR SHAMPOO??
S2	283506	S1(10N)(RECOMMEND? OR SUGGEST? OR PROPOS? OR ENDORS?)
S3	10722700	CONSUMER?? OR CUSTOMER?? OR SHOPPER?? OR BUYER?? OR PURCHA- S? OR INDIVIDUAL?? OR PERSON?? OR CLIENT? OR USER??
S4	17938036	NEED?? OR REQUIREMENT? OR REQUEST? OR DEMAND? OR PROBLEM? - OR ISSUE? OR PREFERENCE?? OR DESIRE?? OR CONCERN?? OR INTERES- T??
S5	215407	(DETERMINE? OR FIGURE? OR CALCULATE? OR COMPUTE? OR ASCERTAIN? OR ASSESS?) (10N)(LIKELIHOOD? OR PROBABLE? OR POSSIBLE? OR ODDS OR POTENTIAL?)
S6	985545	S1(15N)(PERFORM? OR SUCCEED? OR SUCCESS? OR ACHIEVE? OR ACC- OMPLISH? OR USEFUL? OR RESPONSIVE? OR RESPOND? OR SOLVE? OR FI- X??? OR MEET?)
S7	1085345	S3(15N)(CLASSIFY? OR CATEGORIZE? OR GROUP? OR SORT? OR MATCH? OR LINK? OR CONNECT? OR POOL???)
S8	23781	S7(15N)(SIMILAR? OR ALIKE OR COMMON OR RESEMBLE?)
S9	23	S2(S)S5(S)S7
S10	1319	S2(S)S3(S)S4(S)(S5 OR S7)
S11	197	S10(S)S6
S12	1633933	S3(10N)S4
S13	122	S2(S)S12(S)S6(S)S7
S14	6	S2(S)S12(S)S6(S)S8
S15	8	S2(S)S12(S)S5(S)S6
S16	32	S9 OR S14 OR S15
S17	20	S16 NOT S16/2001:2009
S18	20	RD (unique items)

18/3,K/4 (Item 1 from file: 635)
 DIALOG(R)File 635:Business Dateline(R)
 (c) 2009 ProQuest Info&Learning. All rts. reserv.
 0674909 96-32036
 Shiva introduces WebRover solution
 Simeone, Christine
 Business Wire (San Francisco, CA, US) p1
 PUBL DATE: 960220
 WORD COUNT: 1,488